REMARKS

Below, the applicant's comments are preceded by related remarks of the examiner set forth in small bold type.

> **2. Claims 1-4, 8-15 19-23, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al (Brown hereinafter).**
>
> **With reference to claim 1, Brown shows an apparatus for creating a system comprising:**
>
> ***a first agent* [See protocol processing module (PPM) 266, Fig. 8];**
>
> ***a second agent connected to the first agent to receive and transmit events and data* [See PPM 258, Fig. 8. See also the definition of "Wire Connection", lines 23-26, column 4];**
>
> ***a processing agent to process a protocol, the processing agent being connected to the first agent* [See PPM 250, Fig. 8. PPM 250 processes TELNET protocol];**
>
> ***the processing agent being configured to send events to the first agent upon a change in the data being transmitted* [See lines 52-64, column 4. "Messages" in Brown correspond to "events" in the instant application. Changes in data (the output) at the telnet PPM causes events (messages) to be sent to X.25 PPM].**

Brown does not disclose or suggest "a processing agent to receive data, process a protocol in connection with the data, and transmit the data to [a] second network agent, in which the processing agent also sends one or more events to the first agent upon a change in the data being transmitted," as recited in amended claim 1.

The examiner appears to contend that the softblocks 266, 258, and 250 in FIG. 8 of Brown correspond to the first network agent, the second network agent, and the processing agent of claim 1. In the amended claim 1, the processing agent receives data and transmits the data to the second network agent, whereas in Brown the softblock 250 does not transmit data to the softblock 258. Therefore, Brown does not disclose or suggest "a processing agent to receive data ... and transmit the data to [a] second network agent," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, Brown does not disclose or suggest that the softblock 250 send one or more events to the softblock 266 upon a change in the data being transmitted from the softblock 266. The examiner asserts that "Changes in data (the output) at the telnet PPM causes events (messages) to be sent to X.25 PPM." The applicant contends that this is not disclosed or suggested by Brown. Brown merely discloses that "softblock 250 contains a similar hardware interface 253 to connect to a transmission medium, for instance a Telenet transmission format."

(col. 8, lines 6-9) Thus, Brown does not disclose or suggest "the processing agent ... sends one or more events to the first agent upon a change in the data being transmitted," as recited in claim 1.

What is lacking in Brown is also not disclosed or suggested in Generous, which discloses a system for delivery of a message to a subscriber over multiple communications channels. (Abstract)

Claims 11 and 22 are patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-10, 12-21, and 23-29 are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

With regard to claims 30, Brown does not show the specific configuration defined by the claims. However, in view of Generous, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to assemble a system that meet the limitations of the system described by claim 30, for the reasons set forth below.

Generous describes SSL, XML, and load balancing. Brown's invention is for implementing protocol processing module; each of the SSL, XML and load balancing are standard features in an intranet. Because Brown's system allows one to implement PPM in software, one could easily cascade a data source PPM, SSL PPM, XML PPM, and data sink PPM to meet rudimentary system for processing XML documents.

Such a basic system meets the following portions of the claim 30-3l's limitations:

***a buffer to store data* [a buffer associated with message queue on the data source PPM];**

***a first agent coupled to the buffer to receive and transmit events* [the data source, comprising sockets (they contain buffers)];**

***an event system coupled to the first agent to store the events in at least two event queues* [the sockets attached to the first agent and the first processor (the sockets being connected by an XML event wire) are "coupled" to the first agent directly and indirectly.];**

***a first processing agent to process a protocol, the first processing agent having a first and a second connection with the first agent, wherein the first connection transports the data between the first agent and the first processing agent and the second connection transports the events between the first processing agent and the first agent*; [a DOM XML parser PPM (first processing agent) would require two connection lines between itself and the data source (the first agent). One connection would be required to transmit data and the second line would be required to transmit DOM interface requests ("events")] and**

***wherein the first agent is configured to monitor the data being transmitted to and received from the processing agent via the first and second connections.* The sockets that are attached to the data source meet the limitations.**

The motivation for implementing such system is that building blocks in Brown allow one to construct an XML processing system in software. Such system provides the flexibility in implementation. For example, should one wish to exchange the XML parser (using SAX) in the system, one could easily swap in a new SAX XML PPM in place of DOM XML Parser.

Brown and Generous do not disclose or suggest "[a] first network agent that controls transmission of data to the first processing agent at least in part based on the one or more events sent from the first processing agent," as recited in amended claim 30. The amendment to claim 30 is supported by, e.g., page 10, lines 1-12 of applicant's specification.

What Brown discloses is processing of data to enable data exchange between incompatible data communications protocol systems (col. 1, lines 45-49). Brown does not disclose or suggest that a first network agent control transmission of data to a processing agent based on events sent from the processing agent.

Please apply $250 for the excess claims fee, and any other charges or credits, to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 10559-634001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/21/2005

Rex I. Huang* for
David L. Feigenbaum, Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin St.
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

** See attached document certifying that Rex Huang has limited recognition to practice before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office under 37 CFR § 11.9(b).*